

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 19:12:51 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 13:59:12 EDT
From: Clark Fishman (FSAC-FCD) <cfishman@PICA.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: 10 to 20 meter conv
Message-Id: <9409161359.aa11577@FSAC3.PICA.ARMY.MIL>

If Jeff's 10 meter rig covers 29 to 29.5 Mhz, mixing with a 15 MHZ crystal using a double balance mixer terminated in a band splitting diplexer (big word...a bunch of L's and C's in reality and a 50 ohm resistor) would work just fine ...20 meters would come out the other end.

Heat up the soldering iron..

73.2 Clark Fishman WA2UNN cfishman@pica.army.mil

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 19:04:55 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 16:08:25 EDT
From: Clark Fishman (FSAC-FCD) <cfishman@PICA.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: 10-20 meters
Message-Id: <9409161608.aa22977@FSAC3.PICA.ARMY.MIL>

Use a 15 MHz oscillator to mix with 29 to 29.5 to equal 14 to 14.5 mhz.

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 19:04:07 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 16:05:25 EDT
From: Clark Fishman (FSAC-FCD) <cfishman@PICA.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: 10-20meters
Message-Id: <9409161605.aa20953@FSAC3.PICA.ARMY.MIL>

I assume that Jeff's rig covers 28-29.7 MHz...so mix 29 to 29.5

to get 14 to 14.5 mhz....by by birdie...use a double balanced mixer and terminate the IF port with a diplexer....should work like a champ...

Heat up your iron...

Clark Fishman WA2UNN cfishman@pica.army.mil

just got 200 amp electrical service in house....ready for QRP

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 14:34:26 1994

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 09:55:33 -0600
Message-Id: <199409161555.JAA21419@Freenet.HSC.Colorado.EDU>
From: an966@Freenet.HSC.Colorado.EDU (Gene McGahey)
Subject: 30 Mtr QRP Freq?

Has 10.116 been agreed upon as the 30 Mtr. QRP calling freq? which was proposed by someone some months ago? 10.123 & 10.106-8 still appear to have natural appeal for QRPing. Certainly 10.123 is still active with the NWQ Net and activity (excellent)! Using and monitoring 10.116 for several months it appears a good choice to get away from "the Crickets" higher in freq and the QRO's lower. Thought's and ideas would be appreciated. TNX VY Geno AL7GQ/0 Denver
an966@Freenet.HSC.Colorado.EDU

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 13:43:47 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 11:34:30 -0400 (EDT)
From: prvalko <prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu>
Subject: Century 21 Manual
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9409161138.A6741-01000000@vela.acs.oakland.edu>

Silly me... I lost the name(s) of the kind folk that offered me a Century 21 manual (copy). I called Ten*Tec hoping to get an original but they wanted to charge me \$25 for a xerox.

Can someone do this for less? (Even the guy at Ten*Tec said to get some friend to copy off one for you so they are not too concerned with copyrights!)

73 Paul wb8zjl

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 04:06:17 1994
From: "Doyle, Ron" <doyler@uh2297p01.daytonoh.NCR.COM>
Subject: Re: Cures for key fright?
Date: Thu, 15 Sep 94 07:54:00 PDT
Message-Id: <2E78E287@p003103gw1.daytonoh.ncr.com>

Marina King, KA6JWL, writes

> I passed my 13 wpm code test very quickly not because I listened to code tapes, >but because I got involved in QSOs.

This is advice I keep hearing from the best of elmers. I got my 20 wpm by listening to tapes and now I can't hardly send 13 wpm. My brother (Don,

KC5EQC) went the QSO route and passed his 13 wpm test with 100% copy.

Needless to say he can blow my doors off. What little skill I have has come from QSOs so I encourage any newbie (me included) to jump in and do it!

When I do I find the best guys that really help me along and some have to suffer some pretty bad code.

I would also like to put in my 2 cents for code. like Chuck says it's not because it's the newest kind of communications but there is lots of history.

It's the ham's heritage, where we came from. Keeps us in touch with our roots so to speak. I encourage all hams to at least try the code. It ain't fast and it ain't the latest but it sure can be FUN!

Ronald Doyle N8VAR AT&T GIS - Dayton
AT&T GIS: 622-3179 <Ronald.Doyle@DaytonOH.NCR.COM>
(513) 445-3179 FAX: 445-7542

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 14:12:03 1994

Message-Id: <9409161549.AA25857@kaos.ksr.com>

Subject: Re: divide by 2

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 11:49:28 -0400

From: "John F. Woods" <jfw@ksr.com>

> I have a 10M only xcvr (5W!) and [want] to put it on 20M.

It shouldn't be terribly hard; the hardest part would be choosing oscillator frequencies that don't show up as birdies (14+28Mc would probably be the best bet, and would probably require a crystal oscillator/doubler combination). Is the transceiver CW or multimode? If it's CW, it might almost be worthwhile just building a 14Mc transmitter, since the attenuator + mixer + preamp + final amp you'll need on 14Mc will be almost as complicated as an entire new CW rig. If it does SSB too, then doing a whole new modulator certainly isn't worthwhile.

I'm sorry I don't have a canned circuit, but it should be the same principles as any other multiple conversion rig.

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 15:57:09 1994

Message-Id: <9409161714.AA27484@kaos.ksr.com>

Subject: Re: divide by 2

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 13:14:44 -0400

From: "John F. Woods" <jfw@ksr.com>

> the hardest part would be choosing oscillator

> frequencies that don't show up as birdies (14+28Mc would probably be the best

> bet, and would probably require a crystal oscillator/doubler combination).

It occurs to me that even this scheme will have birdies, due to the harmonic relationship between the frequencies in question, BUT at least the second harmonic of the oscillator won't be in the receiver bandpass.

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 14:40:10 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 08:36:40 +0800
From: Raymond.Anderson@EBay.Sun.COM (Ray Anderson)
Message-Id: <9409161536.AA10524@uranium.EBay.Sun.COM>
Subject: re: divide- by- 2 (20m on 10m rig)

> Jeff-

>

> Instead of divide-by-2, it seems like you could possibly
> put a 14.000 mhz mixer on the frontend of the 10m rig. The other
> input to the mixer would be 20m signals (14.000mhz+), so the output of the
> mixer would be 28.000mhz+. This way, there wouldn't be anything to change
> in the radio for receive. Transmit might be a littel trickier, but along
> the same lines (mix 28.000mhz+ with 14.000mhz osc to get 14.000mhz+ out).

>

> - Gary N2JGU

>

>

Gary,

I think the frequency plan you are suggesting above might be a bit troublesome in that unless there is VERY good L0 rejection in the mixer, there will be a 14.000 MHz spur being transmitted continuously due to L0 leak-thru.

72's de WB6TPU Ray

raymonda@uranium.ebay.sun.com

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 16:39:31 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 11:05:25 +0800
From: Raymond.Anderson@EBay.Sun.COM (Ray Anderson)
Message-Id: <9409161805.AA11229@uranium.EBay.Sun.COM>
Subject: re: divide- by- 2 (20m on 10m rig)

> From gmd@adm01.rfc.comm.harris.com Fri Sep 16 10:49 PDT 1994
> From: Gary M Diana <gmd@adm01.rfc.comm.harris.com>
> X-Authentication-Warning: usc02.rfc.comm.harris.com: Host localhost didn't use
HELO protocol
> To: raymond.anderson@EBay
> Subject: re: divide- by- 2 (20m on 10m rig)
> Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 13:29:42 -0400

> X-Mts: smtp
> Content-Type: text
> Content-Length: 253
>
> Ray -
>
> Saw your post about the 20m->10m down convert.
>
> About the 14mhz LO leak thru the osc: I am assuming that
> the 14mhz osc signal can be filtered out before the signal goes
> out onto the antenna. What are your thoughts on that?
>
> 73, Gary N2JGU
>

Gary, the way I read the initial post (attached below), the task was to take a 10 meter rig (28 MHz) and produce a 20 meter output (14 MHz) from it. Initially it was asked if a divide by two scheme would work, but it was suggested that a heterodyne approach of mixing might be more feasible.

So if one uses a subtractive mix $28-14 = 14$ MHz output.

There is no way of effectively filtering the 14 MHz LO from the 14.xxx desired output signal.

If the task was to produce 28 MHz from a 14 MHz rig, then yes you could filter the output without much problem.

I am posting this to the list too as it appears there may be some confusion.

72's de WB6TPU Ray

raymonda@uranium.ebay.sun.com

-----original post-----

Anyone have any ideas how to divide in half the frequency coverage of a transceiver? I have a 10M only xcvr (5W!)

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

and would dearly love to find/build a transverter to put it on 20M. I've never heard of doing something like this

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

before.

Ideas?

Jeff NH6IL

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 10:47:23 1994
From: Gary M Diana <gmd@adm01.rfc.comm.harris.com>
Message-Id: <199409161226.IAA24384@usc02.rfc.comm.harris.com>
Subject: re:divide-by-2 (20m on 10m rig)
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 08:26:25 -0400

Jeff -

Instead of divide-by-2, it seems like you could possibly put a 14.000 mhz mixer on the frontend of the 10m rig. The other input to the mixer would be 20m signals (14.000mhz+), so the output of the mixer would be 28.000mhz+. This way, there wouldn't be anything to change in the radio for receive. Transmit might be a littel trickier, but along the same lines (mix 28.000mhz+ with 14.000mhz osc to get 14.000mhz+ out).

- Gary N2JGU

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Sat Sep 17 00:53:04 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 21:51:12 -0400 (EDT)
From: Brien Pepperdine <pepperb@gov.on.ca>
Subject: HW-8 - I solicit your opinions
Message-Id: <Pine.3.07.9409162112.A28636-b100000@govonca>

Could I have the opinions of anyone with opinions on the HW-8. Reason of course is that I have been offered one at a yet to be determine price by someone who heard I belong to a local qrp club. He built it originally but never really got into qrp or using the rig. Anyhow, he felt I might make better use of it.

So.... what's one like? Will I like it? What is a fair price? What is it like for reception/transmission (selectivity,sensitivity, drift). Subject to intermod? Were xtal filters a standard item?

I know there have been a lot of mods in QRP Q and elsewhere I guess, and I have seen there some book that has been published at some time on a lot of mods (HW-8 Cookbook or Handbook?).

Anyhow, your opinions on the rig are invited for my edification and decision as to whether I should take up the offer. Bottom line is: is it worthwhile to use, will I use it (i.e. like using it and therefore enjoy using it).

BTW, I have an Argonaut 509, and Ne30-30, NorCal 40 and Sierra in stages of being built or planned to be built - so redundancy factor has to be considered.

But if it is a fairly OK radio to use etc. (see all above) then will I welcome it as a decent member of the family available to be used.

Thanks very much for your input and considered opinions/suggestions.
(BTW, what do you figure I would absolutely HAVE to do to it modification-wise?))

72

Brien

VE3VAW

pepperb@gov.on.ca

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 14:10:24 1994

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 10:43:07 -0500

From: adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com (chuck adams)

Message-Id: <9409161543.AA09554@chuck.dallas.sgi.com>

Subject: Re: MFJ Response to Low Down Review - Pg.2

Rich, WOHEP, just sent out a two part posting about the review of the MFJ rig that appeared in the CQC newsletter and the followup.

Having been there myself and taking a beating from others on reviews, I personally prefer an honest review and obviously valid one over a review whereby an individual is "given" a unit to review and write up. Here are MY reasons:

1. If I put out the money, then I have the expectation level set for what the value of the item purchased should be.
2. I expect the item to meet published specs.
3. Yes, sometimes manufacturers will have one unit that will fail to meet specs and have drift problems, birdies, etc. But, when the "network" of owners have a large number of the same problems, then it is my belief that the manufacturer has a problem.
4. I believe it very very unfair for the reviewer to be slam dunked by the manufacturer and others - if the reviewer presented the facts and did a thorough job of finding out how an item performed.

What we all are looking for is the most information we can get to make intellectual decisions about the purchase of equipment and tools. You've seen us get into the "who has the most toys?" postings, but we all realize that few individuals in this world can do this, i.e. get one of everything. So, think of a review as a data point for an individual who is about to purchase one item and only one item and it's their last dollar that they can spend on the hobby. They don't want something that will be a disappointment

that they have to face each time they sit down to get on the air or whatever.

I took a beating from Rich and the gang at CQC when I wrote a review on their publication #1 for this group. They have produced three additional and improved newsletters since then. I would like to think that my review and feedback from others helped in this process of producing a fine newsletter and as a charter member of the group I am proud of the work that they're doing (my number being #44). The greatest thing that they have done is in the last issue, they included a separate sheet that has a complete table on a bunch of rigs with columns for manufacturer, model number, price, type of receiver, vfo or xtal or vxo, current drain, power output if a transmitter, and on and on the table goes. This is a great starting point for someone who is looking for a new rig or their next project for a kit or homebrew.

I'd like to see Rich post the chart, if possible to this group.

1. It'd get wide distribution and become the topic for discussion about a lot of points.
2. It'd become a template for information that others can contribute about rigs not currently on the list and future products that appear.

Another beating that I took, and I don't take this stuff this seriously gang (the beatings that is), was my simple post on the birdies I found in an Index Labs rig and the fact that I sent it back. Index Labs then in turn announced to the rest of the world that I was the only one to have returned same. That may still be true and then it might not be, but that's not the point. Others on this group sent me private mail saying that they found similar points on their rig and someone posted to this group that Index Labs "fixed" the birdies. My question was why did they have the birdies in the first place? And I still haven't heard about the WWV frequencies and how that was solved.

Of all the equipment that I own and of all the many many kits that I have built over the last three or four years, I have only had one that did not work. I have not published this and will not, 'cuz it wouldn't do any good and it seems that the group of us that got the first kits all had the same problem(s). The kit manufacturer I don't hear from or about anymore anyway.

So my point is that reviews are critical information for the consumers (us) and valuable for the manufacturer(s). A company that does not listen to the valid critical reviews will not and should not be in business. No one is perfect and we will take mistakes as an everyday part of life, but I am concerned about the manner in which problems are handled and solved. I know that there is a considerable expense in public relations and customer satisfaction issues for a company, club, group, and individuals. A company has to make a decision on total recall of a product or products based on

the seriousness of the problem.

I am not pointing fingers and please do not construe this posting as anything other than my \$0.02 worth on the issue.

This group is very valuable. Many of the 'silent majority' in this group have seen what happens to critical reviews and may have a negative review that they'd like to make public but fear what will happen if they do so. I don't blame them. But everyone has the right to their opinion and quantitative reviews done correctly with all the parameters known are not opinions but cold hard facts. All I can say is keep them coming.

dit dit

Chuck Adams K5FO CP-60

adams@sgi.com

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 18:00:29 1994

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 08:31:41 -0700 (PDT)

From: stark <mswmod@sage.unr.edu>

Subject: Re: MFJ Response to Low Down Review - Pg.2

Message-Id: <Pine.3.05.9409160840.A5007-b100000@nimbus>

On Thu, 15 Sep 1994 CQC@aol.com wrote:

> Continued....

>

> The MFJ-9040 is one of my favorite radios, and I certainly want everybody who
> owns one to enjoy it fully. If any of your readers are experiencing a drift
> problem, they should contact MFJ right away and get it fixed. The service
> technicians now know the exact cause, and know what to do to make it right!

>

> Thanks for working with us, and congratulations on a great club!

>

> 72,

>

> Rick

>

I called MFJ and the tech was very nice. He sent out 4 caps to change. (Maybe it's 6. Am at work now and can't remember for sure). Will let you all know if it cures the drift.

But.....I just recieved my new-to-me TS930AT yesterday afternoon. Wow.....

And getting ready for winter so might be a bit before I get the mods done.

73's & 72's, Ron

PS. Had a nitch chat with Wayne the other night on 40m. He was using a Sierra and it sure sounded nice. Then the qrm hit and that was it! Oh well.....

.....KU7Y.....
.....Monte "Ron" Stark.....
.....Sun Valley, Nevada.....

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 18:05:02 1994
From: Gary M Diana <gmd@adm01.rfc.comm.harris.com>
Message-Id: <199409161711.NAA00315@usc02.rfc.comm.harris.com>
Subject: northeast QRP SSB sched?
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 13:11:37 -0400

Hello All -

Brad (wb8ygg) and I will be attempting some short-haul (130 mi.) 80m qrp ssb this coming saturday evening, with the Epiphytes of course. We plan to on 3.756mhz +/- between 2130 and 2200 EST. If you can hear us, join in... if you can't hear us, then join in anyway and have your own QS0! Hopefully the band won't be full of static crashes.

Hope to hear you in there.
73, Gary N2JGU

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 18:06:01 1994
Message-Id: <9409161947.AA28553@ig1.att.att.com>
From: mvjfm@mvubr.att.com (James M Fitton +1 508 960 2577)
Date: 16 Sep 94 19:44:00 GMT
Subject: Re: One last question

Subject: One last question

What is the preferred CQ for the contest? CQ QRPNE? CQ QRP FD? CQ QRP AF?

--Wayne

Let's go with CQ QRP TEST

72 Jim W1FMR

h

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 22:16:11 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 16:38:21 -0500
From: adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com (chuck adams)
Message-Id: <9409162138.AA10421@chuck.dallas.sgi.com>
Subject: QRP Afield

Saturday, if you hear K5FO during the test, please do
not try to run at a speed faster than the sending speed.
Reason: I may not be the person on the key.

BTW: We have predictions of rain and thunderboomers
for the weekend. Wouldn't you know it.

gl n tst es cul

dit dit
SIG
Chuck Adams K5FO CP-60
adams@sgi.com

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 14:22:01 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 08:43:31 +0800
From: Raymond.Anderson@EBay.Sun.COM (Ray Anderson)
Message-Id: <9409161543.AA10532@uranium.EBay.Sun.COM>
Subject: Re: QRP Digital

I've been running 2 meter packet with an old Yaesu HT that has the
final transistor frapped. The feed-thru from the driver stage (about
50 milliwatts) is the output power. I've been running it that way
for about 5 years as it works so well I never felt inclined to
replace the output device. Does that qualify for QRP ?? :)

72's de WB6TPU Ray

raymonda@uranium.ebay.sun.com

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 17:48:07 1994
From: jcumming@clark.dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings)
Message-Id: <9409161853.AA11936@clark.dgim.doc.ca>
Subject: Re: QRP Digital
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 14:53:19 -0400 (EDT)

Hello Ray:

In your earlier posting you said:

>
>
> I've been running 2 meter packet with an old Yaesu HT that has the
> final transistor frapped. The feed-thru from the driver stage (about
> 50 milliwatts) is the output power. I've been running it that way
> for about 5 years as it works so well I never felt inclined to
> replace the output device. Does that qualify for QRP ?? :)
>
>
> 72's de WB6TPU Ray
>
> raymonda@uranium.ebay.sun.com
>

I guess your setup does qualify as QRP is 5 watts or less. However, because you are QRPP, your transmissions would contribute to the Hidden Transmitter Syndrome. One of the assumptions in packet is that all stations can hear each other. That is certainly not always the case for vhf packet, and an impossible proposition for HF (bbbbooorriinnnggg). We have installed a packet repeater in Ottawa and this has gone a long way in solving this problem because then everybody has an equal shot.

73 and have a good weekend

Jim VE3XJ

From owner-qrp-1@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 11:35:42 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 08:28:42 CDT
From: msdooley@collie.aud.alcatel.com (Michael S. Dooley)
Message-Id: <9409161328.AA18422@collie.aud.alcatel.com>
Subject: Re: QRP Digital (was Re:Flaming of K5F0)

[snip, snip]

> Actually, QRP digital sounds kind of interesting! It seems to me that
> there is lots of room for QRP-style digital rigs, assuming the power
> limit isn't a major problem for digital comms. How about a monoband QRP
> rig with an integrated RTTY modem? A laptop or one of those "handy
> terminals" that show up in surplus could be the terminal.

>

> Has anyone tried something like this? Eric, is your digital operation
> QRO or QRP?

>

> Stephen

>

>

> --

> Stephen Trier "Here, but for an extraordinary physics teacher,
> sct@po.cwru.edu goes a saxophone player."
> KG8IH - Albert Overhauser, National Science Medal winner

>

>

Actually I occasionally run RTTY with a QRO rig. My last contact was with a
fellow in Illinois somewhere who was running a Drake station at 300 watts
or so. We had a nice QSO, but he couldn't believe I was only running 20
watts. See, even though my QRO station will run up to 600 watts, I prefer
to operate with the minimum power necessary to do the job. That's also
why I like QRP.

Mike Dooley KE4PC

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 11:42:39 1994

From: jcumming@clark.dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings)

Message-Id: <9409161316.AA02808@clark.dgim.doc.ca>

Subject: Re: QRP Digital (was Re:Flaming of K5F0)

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 09:16:05 -0400 (EDT)

>

> Actually, QRP digital sounds kind of interesting! It seems to me that
> there is lots of room for QRP-style digital rigs, assuming the power
> limit isn't a major problem for digital comms. How about a monoband QRP
> rig with an integrated RTTY modem? A laptop or one of those "handy
> terminals" that show up in surplus could be the terminal.

>

> Has anyone tried something like this? Eric, is your digital operation
> QRO or QRP?

>

> Stephen

>

>

> --

> Stephen Trier "Here, but for an extraordinary physics teacher,
> sct@po.cwru.edu goes a saxophone player."
> KG8IH - Albert Overhauser, National Science Medal winner
>
>

Hello Stephen:

QRP digital is a real challenge. I am using a powered-down IC751A and have confirmed 65 countries in a little over a year and a half (I have not done much in the last 5 months as I have been working on the house and little or no time for playing with radio - pride of ownership and all that sort of deary stuff!! hi hi)

Anyways, I have Kanga CSP CW/SSB 20 metre transciever boards all built, but not interwired. It is my intention to modify it for digital operation, i.e. true FSK. You are correct in saying that feeding the tones into the mike jack is sufficient (many call it AFSK, but that's a misnomer), I prefer direct FSK.

Modification of CW rigs for FSK operation is, usually, quite simple. For instance, those rigs using simple LC VFOs can be modified by the addition of a padding capacitor that is adjusted so that when engaged results in a carrier shift of 170 Hz. A capicator is ok, but a varactor may be better - I don't really know, but when I am done with the CSP (don't hold your breath - I am in the process of installing a tower with HF and VHF Yagis and dipoles and then I have to make 60 pounds of sausage and then paint the kitchen) I'll let the list know of my results.

I have not too much interest in developing an RTTY modem. Considering the filtering and stability problems involved, it is not likely worth the effort for the average homebrewer. Maybe this is a challenge for our digital bretheren. However, it would me really neat to get these MMCs (Multi-mode Controllers - PK232, KAM, etc) in smaller packages. Perhaps with the development of DSP technology the filtering headaches are relatively trivial. However, there is the challenge of software development, and that really is beyond my capabilities.

However, I am really excited by a recent development in power control of digital transmissions. Power control is inherent in CLOVER, but has not been too widely discussed in the amateur press. Power control is the process by which the Information Sending Station will automatically adjust its power at levels so that recieved acknowledgements continue to be recieved. In other words, it will automatically decrease power gradually until such time acknowledgements from the Receiving Information Stations start to ask for repeat transmissions. If conditions change, transmitted power will increase as demanded. There was a most intriguing article on constructing such a device in QST last year as I recall (let me know if you want the reference, be glad to let you know). The author in

the article had the opinion that with this box, one of the claims of CW operation is no longer true. This claim is that CW gets through when no other mode will. Amazingly, there was no comment against that opinion in subsequent QST issues. That means either nobody reads QST technical articles, or the CW lobby could refute the contention! Finally, this capability is not available to Baudot, it can only be used by protocols that have handshaking - Amtor and Pactor, and as I have said, it is already a feature of Clover.

73 and live better digitally

Jim VE3XJ

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 16:45:21 1994
From: ddoyle@arinc.com
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 13:01:06 EST
Message-Id: <9408167797.AA779749536@ccmail.arinc.com>
Subject: QRP Frequencies

Howdy all,

I'm another one of those green horns just getting interested in QRP. All of those lists of equipment have been quite interested, even though I don't know what 90% of them are, but I'm learning.

I would like to get a little more involved but don't really know what frequencies QRPers hang out on. I've noticed that some are operating on 7.035 and 14.030, correct? What other frequencies are generally used. I'm not opposed to looking them up... Ok, I admit it, I'm just lazy.

73s de Don Doyle KC5EQC

Donald Doyle KC5EQC Internet Address: <DDOYLE@ARINC.COM>
ARINC Research Corporation Phone: (918) 250-8448
Triad Center I, Suite 625 FAX: (918) 252-7331
7666 East 61st Street
Tulsa, OK 74133-1155

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 17:30:07 1994
Message-Id: <9409161843.AA24056@ig1.att.att.com>

From: mvjif@mvubr.att.com (James M Fitton +1 508 960 2577)
Date: 16 Sep 94 18:41:00 GMT
Subject: Re: QRP-Afield questions

Jim,

(1) Can we work stations who are not self-proclaimed contest entries?

*Yes - Points are for each different contact made per band.

(2) Does a station worked on multiple bands count for contact points on each band? (It's clear from your rules that it doesn't count more than once as a multiplier.)

*Yes - Points are for each different contact made per band.

(3) Are voice modes prohibited because the contest emphasizes homebrew (translation: 95% CW)? Or did you have some other reason?

*This particular event is for CW only.... in order to KIS....

72 Wayne, N6KR

Since this 1994 QRP-AFIELD is the first one, it will be interesting to see what happens, and where it goes from here.

AA1EX will be operating from Maine
W1FMR, N1CUU from NH
KA9HAO from RI

72 Jim W1FMR

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 10:39:42 1994
From: Mike.Czuhajewski@hambbs.wb3ffv.ampr.org (Mike Czuhajewski)
Subject: ReReReRe HW-7 mods
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 06:36:30 EST5EDT
Message-Id: <1994Sep16.063630.20338@wb3ffv.ampr.org>

Regarding K7YHAs comments on the KN1H article, Johns words to me were that the schematic made a poor transition from his original to the printed page. I don't think it was redrawn incorrectly in the sense that errors were added, but very well may not be the same way he drew it. In any case the schematic as printed was very confusing and hard to follow. Now that I have a copy of KeyCad to draw schematics on the computer, I'm strongly thinking about drawing it up right and having it printed somewhere (probably in the QRP Quarterly). Think of the schematic in the KN1H article as a puzzle or challenge, a great opportunity to test your interpretive skills! (The prize for correctly solving it is an improved HW-7 receiver.) 73 and Queue Our Pea DE
WA8MCQ.

--

Mike Czuhajewski, user of the UniBoard System @ wb3ffv.ampr.org
E-Mail: Mike.Czuhajewski@hambbs.wb3ffv.ampr.org
The WB3FFV Amateur Radio BBS - Located in Baltimore, Maryland USA
Supporting the Amateur Radio Hobby, and TCP/IP InterNetworking

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 08:38:30 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 09:51:56 +0100 (BST)
From: Malcolm Austen <malcolm.austen@computing-services.oxford.ac.uk>
Subject: Unix ... keeping list msgs separate
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9409160952.B25657-0100000@sable.ox.ac.uk>

Following requests for info, I now have a file of notes on my use of the (unix) elm filter utility. They are not exactly extensive, but too big to want to post to the list. Email me direct if you want a copy.

Malcolm, g1lys, gqrp-3365

+

Malcolm Austen,	Tel: +44(0) 1865 273216
Oxford University Computing Services,	Fax: +44(0) 1865 273275
13 Banbury Road,	Email - JANET: malcolm.austen@uk.ac.ox.oucs
Oxford, OX2 6NN, England	Internet: malcolm.austen@oucs.ox.ac.uk

+

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 01:16:15 1994
From: rander@netcom.com (Raymond Anderson)
Message-Id: <199409160333.UAA09633@netcom13.netcom.com>
Subject: When and where was T2 article published??
Date: Thu, 15 Sep 1994 20:33:12 -0700 (PDT)

Does anyone remember offhand where and when the T2 construction
article was published ??

72's de Ray WB6TPU

raymonda@uranium.ebay.sun.com

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 03:11:53 1994
From: mont@netcom.com (Mont Pierce)
Message-Id: <199409160545.WAA23626@netcom13.netcom.com>
Subject: Re: When and where was T2 article published??
Date: Thu, 15 Sep 1994 22:45:41 -0700 (PDT)

>
> Does anyone remember offhand where and when the T2 construction
> article was published ??

QST on April 1993, title: A Multimode Phasing Exciter for 1 t 500 MHZ.
Nicknamed the T2, to match the R2.

72/73

km6wt

--

Mont Pierce

```
+-----+
| Ham Call: KM6WT           Internet:  mont@netcom.com |
|   bands: 80/40/20/15/10/2 |
|   modes: cw,ssb,fm        |
+-----+
```

From owner-qrp-l@netcom.com Fri Sep 16 14:29:05 1994
Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 08:48:24 +0800
From: Raymond.Anderson@EBay.Sun.COM (Ray Anderson)
Message-Id: <9409161548.AA10547@uranium.EBay.Sun.COM>
Subject: Re: where and when T2 was published

Thanks to all who replied with the info on the location of the T2
article.

For those who might be interested, here is the info
on the R1, R2, and T2 articles:

R1	Aug. 92	QST	pg 19
R2	Jan. 93	QST	pg 32
T2	Apr. 93	QST	pg 27

Thanks for the assistance.

72's de WB6TPU Ray

raymonda@uranium.ebay.sun.com